



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/863,457 05/27/97 KRISHNAMURTHI

R QCPA377CIP

EXAMINER

LM01/0626

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
5775 MOREHOUSE DRIVE
SAN DIEGO CA 92121-1714

NGUYEN, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2731

DATE MAILED:

06/26/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/863,457

Applicant(s)

Krishnamurthi

Examiner

Steven Nguyen

Group Art Unit

2731



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 16, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☒ The proposed drawing correction, filed on Nov 29, 1999 is ☒ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2731

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on 5/16/2000 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/863457 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "glare condition" is vague and indefinite because it's unclear what constitutes for it.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2731

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Spartz et al. (Spartz).

In U.S. patent No. 5,878,036 Spartz discloses a mobile switching center (MSC) 16 connected to a base station sub-system (BSS) 15 via an A-interface (Fig. 1). As shown in Fig. 6, the MSC transmits a paging signal 300 (a message signal) to the BSS when detecting a subscriber unit is being paged after another call ends (a glare condition). The BSS receives the paging signal 300 and then transmits a page message signal (a subsequent message signal) to the subscriber unit via the air interface (see col. 14). It is noted that the claimed Paging Response Message and Service Request Message have no functions to distinguish from the paging signal (Fig. 6) for a second call and the disconnect signal (Fig. 8) for a first call as two call occur in secession.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2731

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 4, 5, 7, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spartz in view of Baldwin et al. (Baldwin).

Spartz does not explicitly recite that the paging signal and the page message signal are Alert With Information Message Signals.

In U.S. patent No. 5,633,868 Baldwin shows transmitting Alert With Information Message Signals between a wireless gateway and a subsystem of a CDMA wireless network (col. 10, lines 20-24, and Fig. 4). To use Alert With Information Message Signals would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because Alert With Information Messages have been widely used to represent incoming calls and other data from a base station to a mobile unit over a voice channel.

Art Unit: 2731

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 2/18/2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9 and 11-13, the applicant states that Spartz et al fails to disclose a glare condition. The examiner disagrees with the applicant because the glare condition is rejected as indicated at the paragraph 5 of previous office action which mailed 2/18/99. Because the term glare condition reads on another call end in the broader term.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the glare condition which defined in the specification) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Therefore, the rejections maintain.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2731

Bolon (USP 5822420) discloses a signaling protocol for multilink access network local exchange interface such as glare condition.


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-8848. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham, can be reached on (703) 305-4378.

The fax phone number for this group is (703) 305-3988.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Steven Nguyen
Art Unit 2731
June 21, 2000


CHI H. PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700
6/23/00